DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 164 CS 207 644

AUTHOR Grunig, James E.
TITLE Organizations, Environments, and Models of Public Relations.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (66th, Corvallis, OR, August 6-9, 1983). Print is broken and light.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Institutional Environment; *Management Systems; *Models; *Organizational Communication; *Organizations (Groups); *Public Relations; Research Methodology; *Theories

ABSTRACT

Noting that little theory has been developed to explain how and why organizations choose to manage public relations, this paper argues that theorists cannot improve the practice of public relations until they can explain what public relations is and what it contributes to the functions of an organization. The paper addresses that issue by continuing a research program begun in a 1976 issue of "Journalism Monographs," in which the relationship between two kinds of organizations, the "problem solving" and the "fatalistic," and two kinds of public relations, diachronic and synchronic, were analyzed. The paper enlarges that dichotomous theory to include four models of public relations: (1) the press agency/publicity, (2) public information, (3) two-way asymmetric, and (4) two-way symmetric models. It then develops two typologies of organizations based upon their product/service and political/regulatory environments to explain the types of organizations that use each of the models. The paper conceptualizes the four models based upon public relations history, then presents four indices to measure the models, along with the results of a reliability analysis of the indices. In conclusion, the paper presents the results of case studies of 16 organizations in which interviewers measured the public relations models and related them to organizations and environmental variables. (The questionnaire used in the case studies is appended.) (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232164

Public Relations Division

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ORGANIZATIONS, ENVIRONMENTS, AND MODELS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James E. Grunig
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By
James E. Grunig
Professor

College of Journalism
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Corvallis, Oregon, August 6-9, 1983

CS 207644

ORGANIZATIONS, ENVIRONMENTS, AND MODELS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

James E. Grunig, University of Maryland, College Park

Abstract

Public relations researchers have developed little theory to explain how and why organizations choose to manage public relations in different ways. Yet, theorists can do little to improve the practice of public relations until they can explain what public relations is and what it contributes to the functioning of an organization.

This paper addresses that research question by continuing the research program began in Journalism Monograph No. 46, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory," published in 1976. In that monograph, Grunig analyzed the relationship between two kinds of organizations, the "problem-solving" and the "fatalistic" organization, and two kinds of public relations, "diachronic" and "synchronic." In this paper, Grunig enlarges that dichotomous theory to include four "models" of public relations: the press agentry/publicity, public information, two-way asymmetric, and two-way symmetric models. He then develops two typologies of organizations, based upon their product/service and political/regulatory environments to explain the types of organizations that use each model of public relations.

The author conceptualizes the four models of public relations, based upon public relations history. He then develops four indices to measure the four models today and presents the results of a reliability analysis of the four indices. Finally, he presents the results of case studies of 16 organizations, in which interviewers measured the public relations models and related them to organizational and environmental variables.

ORGANIZATIONS, ENVIRONMENTS, AND MODELS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

James E. Grunig
University of Maryland, College Park

Public relations can be defined simply as "the management of communication between an organization and its publics" (Grunig and Hunt, 1984:6). That definition can be used to identify several public relations problems meriting research: the behavior of publics, the effect of communication on publics, and how and why organizations choose to manage communication in different ways. Most public relations research--like most mass communication research--has examined the effect of communication (messages or campaigns) on publics. Researchers have also studied the behavior of publics (e.g., Grunig, 1983); but, with the exception of Grunig (1976), few have systematically tried to explain why organizations practice public relations as they do.

Yet, public relations researchers probably have no more important problem to solve. For, as Ehling (1981) has said, we cannot begin to improve the practice of public relations until we can explain what it is and what it contributes to the functioning of an organization. In this article, I address the theoretical question of how public relations behavior varies in response to the environment and structure of organizations. The article extends the research program begun on the relationship between organizations and public relations in Grunig (1976), by improving upon and expanding that theoretical conceptualization. It then presents evidence from exploratory research to support the revised conceptualization.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

In the 1976 monograph, I conceptualized two kinds of public relations behavior and asked, as the central research question of the study, why some practititioners "engage in informative and two-way communication and others in one-way, manipulative communication? (p. 1). In theoretical terms, I categorized these two kinds of public relations as Thayer's (1968:129-130) synchronic and diachronic communication. Synchronic communication is asymmetric in that the organization uses public relations to "synchronize" the behavior of publics with its own behavior. Diachronic communication is symmetric: organization and publics attempt to reach a "state-of-affairs" that is acceptable to all. To measure synchronic and diachronic public relations, I used factor analysis to group specific public relations procedures--such as issuing press releases or doing evaluation research--onto factors that resembled these two general models of public relations.

Factor analysis also identified two kinds of organizations similar to those described in the organizational literature:

*A "problem-solving" organization, which had a dynamic environment and a complex, decentralized, unstratified, and formalized structure.

*A "fatalistic" organization, which had a static environment that constrained the organization and a centralized and stratified structure that was less complex and less formalized than that of the problem-solving organization.

The characteristics of these two types of organizations closely resembled those of "organic" and "mechanistic" organizations (Burns and Stalker, 1961), organizational types widely used

by organizational researchers. The major exception was that my problem-solving organization was more formalized--had more rules and regulations--than my fatalistic organization, whereas the organizational literature suggested the opposite.

I hypothesized that problem-solving organizations would practice diachronic public relations and fatalistic organizations synchronic public relations. Instead, I found that problem-solving organizations practiced more of both types of public relations than the fatalistic organizations. And I found the problem-solving organizations practiced more synchronic than diachronic public relations. Q factor analysis, however, identified a special category of problem-solving organizations that practiced diachronic public relations--small, new, and less formalized organizations employing a "professional" rather than a "careerist" public relations practitioner.

Although I was successful in accounting for the types of organizations that practiced the two types of public relations, the results were not theoretically pleasing. The relationships in the data did not fit a logical pattern in which two kinds of organizations used two kinds of public relations to deal with two kinds of environments. It now seems clear that both I and the organizational theorists had developed theories that were too simple to explain the public relations behaviors and organizational structures and environments that exist in the real world.

In particular, there seem to be four rather than two models of public relations in practice, and single organizations appear to practice combinations of the four models (Grunig and Hunt, 1984:Chapters 1 and 2). Similarly, recent theorizing on organiza-

tions (Hage, 1980) shows that a dichotomous theory of organizations and environments also oversimplifies reality. A conceptual merger of my four models of public relations with Hage's theory of four organization types found in distinct environmental niches seems to offer great promise for developing a pleasing--and valid theory of the relationships among environments, organizations, and public relations departments.

As a first step in developing this revised theory, we turn next to the newly conceptualized public relations models, which serve as dependent variables in the theory.

FOUR MODELS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Scientists use the term "model" to describe a simplified representation of reality. All models are false--at least in part--because they cannot represent all of reality. The human mind must rely on models because it can only isolate and grasp key variables that can be abstracted from reality. The mind cannot grasp all of reality. "Synchronic" and "diachronic" were names I had given to two models of public relations that I believed captured the essential charactistics of public relations behavior.

Now, these two models appear to oversimplify actual public relations behavior, mostly because they assume that all one-way communication must be manipulative or asymmetric and that all two-way communication will be informative and symmetric. Many organizations, such as universities or government agencies, provide one-way communication that is truthful and informative and benefits publics as much or more as it benefits the organization.

Other organizations use two-way communication to manipulate rather than adapt to publics. Their public relations practitioners

do research--seek information--to determine what publics like and dislike about the organizations and then give information to those publics that describes the organization as having attributes the public favors and ignores attributes of which the public disapproves. The PR people then research feedback from the publics to determine if the publics have changed their attitudes and behaviors to those the organization desires.

Public relations behavior, in other words, seems to vary along two independent dimensions rather than one--one-way vs. two-way and asymmetric vs. symmetric. It follows, then, that there should be four models of public relations, which represent the combinations of the two dimensions. Grunig and Hunt (1984) called these four models:

*Press agentry/publicity (a one-way asymmetric model).

*Public information (a one-way symmetric model).

*Two-way asymmetric.

*Two-way symmetric.

Grunig and Hunt (1984:Chapter 2) developed these models as historical stages in the development of public relations. However, they observed that the earlier models did not disappear as the newer ones developed. Today, some organizations practice each of the four models. Generally, organizations practice the model that most logically helps them to cope with and have an impact upon their environments.

Press agentry, the first stage of public relations, was typified by the promotional wizardry of P.T. Barnum in the middle of the nineteenth century. Ivy Lee began a second stage of public relations, which Grunig and Hunt called public information, at the

beginning of the twentieth century. Lee believed, in essence, that public relations people were "journalists in residence" who should provide truthful and accurate information about their client organizations. In contrast to the press agents, Lee believed public relations people should represent public as well as organizational

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Four Models of Public Relations

Characteristic	Model: Press Agentry/ Publicity	Public Information	Two-Way Asymmetric	Two-Way Symmetric
Purpose	Propaganda	Dissemination of Information	Scientific Persuasion	Mutual Understanding
Organizational Goal	Environmental Control/ Domination	Environmental Adaptation/ Cooperation	Environmental Control/ Domination	Environmental Adaptation Cooperation
PR Contribution to Goal	Advocacy	Dissemination of Information	Advocacy	Mediation
Nature of Communication	One-Way, Complete Truth Not Essential	One-Way, Truth Important	Two-Way, Imbalanced Effects	Two-Way Balanced Effects
Communication Model	Source--->Rec.	Source--->Rec.	Source--->Rec. <-------- Feedback	Group--->Group <---
Nature of Research	Little; "Counting House"	Little; Readability, Readership	Formative, Evaluative of Attitudes	Formative, Evaluative of Understanding
Leading Historical Figures	P. T. Barnum	Ivy Lee	Edward L. Bernays	Bernays, Educators, Prof. Leaders
Where Practiced Today	Sports, Theatre, Product Promotion	Government, Non-profit, Associations, Business	Competitive Business, Agencies	Regulated Business, Agencies

Source: Adapted from Grunig and Hunt (1984:22)

interests--i.e., provide symmetric public relations. Lee used intuition rather than research to determine public interests, however. Thus, his public information approach was a one-way model.

The two-way asymmetric model had its intellectual roots in the work of the Committee on Public Information, headed by George Creel, during World War I. Edward L. Bernays, who worked in a supporting role on the Creel committee, later supplied most of the social science theory for the asymmetric model. For example, in the opening paragraph of his 1928 book Propaganda, Bernays wrote that "the conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society" (Bernays, 1928:9). Although Bernays' model of public relations clearly was asymmetric, he believed that manipulating publics to behave as organizations want them to behave would benefit these publics.

The historical roots of the two-way symmetric model cannot be traced to a single typical practitioner as easily as can the other models. Both Bernays and Ivy Lee had said that public relations should represent the client to the organization as well as the organization to the client. Historical discussions of their work show, however, that both did more to represent organizations than clients. Public relations textbooks, especially those written by educators, have also called for the practice of the symmetric model--especially those written in the 1950s and later. In the first edition of their textbook, for example, Cutlip and Center (1952:15-16) defined public relations in symmetric terms as "the communication and interpretation of information, ideas, and opinon ...from publics to the institution in an effort to bring the two

into harmonious adjustment.'

Table 1 describes several dimensions that discriminate among the four models as they are practiced today. Most of Table 1 needs little additional explanation, but three dimensions--organizational goal, communication model, and type of organization using the model--require some elaboration.

The two organizational goals were derived from Katz and Kahn's (1978:251) discussion of organizational effectiveness as conceptualized from a systems perspective and Hage's (1980:452) discussion of domination and interdependence in interorganizational relations. To be successful, the organization must be in equilibrium with its environment. It can attain equilibrium by controlling (dominating) publics and other organizations in its environment or by adapting to (cooperating with) them. Both asymmetric forms of public relations--press agentry/publicity and two-way asymmetric--help the organization to dominate the environment. The symmetric models--public information and two-way symmetric--help the organization to maintain its interdependence with the environment.

Communication in the press agentry and public information models can be depicted in a simple 'source-to-receiver' model. A feedback loop is added to this communication model for the two-way asymmetric model. The two-way symmetric communication model, however, contains two 'groups' rather than a 'source' and 'receiver.' Communication in that model takes place as a transaction, and neither participant can be isolated as the source and the other as the receiver.

Table 1 also shows that Grunig and Hunt (1984) believed public relations practitioners who promote sports, theatre, products, or

causes employ the press-agentry/publicity model and that government agencies, nonprofit organizations (such as universities and hospitals), associations, and some business firms use the public-information model. They believed business firms in highly competitive industries use the two-way asymmetric model most--generally in support of marketing objectives. And, they believed that regulated business firms use the symmetric model to demonstrate that they are socially responsible and that they do not need to be regulated.

EMPIRICAL MEASUREMENT OF THE FOUR MODELS

If these four models of public relations are to serve as the dependent variables in an organizational theory of public relations behavior, it is necessary to demonstrate that the models can be measured reliably and that organizations actually practice them. We attempted to measure the models, and to demonstrate the reliability of the measures, as part of an exploratory study of 16 organizations in the Washington-Baltimore area.

We began by writing 27 items that would fit into an eight-item index for each of the four models. These items were written following the logic of the dimensions used to discriminate among the models in Table 1. Some items were included in two indices--the items on control or adaptation as organizational goals, one-way or two-way communication, and advocacy as a public relations objective--but all other items were used in the index for only one model. No two indices shared more than two items.

We then chose a purposive sample of 16 organizations to represent the range of organizations practicing public relations. The small sample allowed us to do in-depth interviewing in the 16 org-

anizations that would not be possible in a larger, random sample. However, the purposive sample prohibits us from generalizing the results to a larger population of organizations. To construct the purposive sample, we chose four organizations that we believed practiced each model of public relations. One of the four organizations chosen for each model was a corporation, one a government agency, one a nonprofit organization, and one an association.

Graduate students enrolled in the Seminar in Public Relations Management at the University of Maryland interviewed up to five public relations practitioners in each organization and asked them to complete the 27-item questionnaire measuring the four models. (They also obtained information on the organization's environment and structure, which will be reported below.) Research could not be completed on the nonprofit organization with the public-information model, and completed questionnaires could not be obtained in two other organizations. The public relations program at a large state university included in the sample had departments for both its central administration and its largest campus. Thus, we treated the central administration and the campus as separate organizations. In total, 59 PR practitioners in 14 organizations completed the questionnaire on the models, of which seven had missing data on one or more of the indices.

Reliability of the Four Indices

Tables 2 through 5 report the results of a reliability analysis of the four indices. The most important statistic in the four tables is Cronbach's alpha, which indicates the proportion of variance measured by an index to the true variance in the population (Cronbach, 1970:160-168). The tables also include split-half cor-

TABLE 2
Reliability Analysis of Press Agentry/Publicity Index

Item	Mean (Scale= 1-5)	Item-Total Correlation	Alpha Without Item
Purpose of Public Relations:			
The purpose of public relations in this organization is to publicize the organization, its products, and its services in any way possible	3.42	.41	.72
In this organization, public relations and promotion mean essentially the same thing	2.85	.64	.66
Organizational Goal (Control):			
In a broad sense, I would say the primary goal of our public relations program is to help the organization control the publics that affect it	2.86	.30	.74
Public Relations Role (Advocacy):			
This organization perceives the public relations department, first and foremost, to be an advocate for the organization	4.09	.13	.76
Nature of Communication (One-Way):			
Most public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication--from the organization to publics	3.10	.57	.68
Media Relations as Example of Communication:			
Our media relations program strives to get favorable publicity into the media and to keep unfavorable publicity out	3.60	.27	.74
Role of Research:			
Our public relations people believe that public relations essentially is an art that cannot be measured and evaluated	2.42	.50	.70
If people show up for an event or use our products or services, we know that our public relations efforts have been successful	3.29	.62	.67

For Entire Scale (n = 52):
Cronbach's Alpha = .74
Split-Half Correlation = .54

TABLE 3
Reliability Analysis of Public Information Index

Item	Mean (Scale= 1-5)	Item-Total Correlation	Alpha Without Item
Purpose of Public Relations:			
*The purpose of public relations in this organization is to disseminate information to the public as truthfully and accurately as possible.....	4.36	.01	.38
In this organization, public relations people are essentially journalists in residence.....	2.81	.56	.55
Organizational Goal (Adaptation):			
*In a broad sense, I would say the primary goal of our public relations program is to help the organization change to reduce the negative impact it has on its publics....	2.45	-.16	.48
Public Relations Role (Dissemination):			
This organization believes the public relations department should be more of a neutral disseminator of information than an advocate for the organization or a mediator between management and publics..	2.36	.09	.74
Nature of Communication (One-Way):			
Most public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication--from the organization to publics...	3.10	.39	.64
Media Relations as Example of Communication:			
*Our media relations philosophy is to tell the truth to the media even if it is unfavorable to the organization.....	3.80	-.22	.47
Role of Research:			
In our public relations department, nearly everyone is so busy writing news releases or producing publications that there is no time to do any research.....	3.07	.46	.60
Keeping a clipping file is about the only way we have of monitoring the success of our public relations programs	2.42	.66	.51

*Items deleted from scale; correlation and Alpha based on 8-item scale (alpha = .36)
For 5-Item Scale (n = 52):
Cronbach's Alpha = .67
Split-Half Correlation = .50

TABLE 4
Reliability Analysis of Two-Way Asymmetric Index

Item	Mean (Scale= 1-5)	Item-Total Correlation	Alpha Without Item
Purpose of Public Relations:			
The purpose of public relations in this organization is to persuade the public to agree with the organization's point-of-view.....	3.56	.28	.54
In this organization, we try to determine what public attitudes are toward the organization and how they might be changed....	3.47	.52	.46
Organizational Goal (Control):			
In a broad sense, I would say the primary goal of our public relations program is to help the organization control the publics that affect it.....	2.86	.11	.61
Public Relations Role (Advocacy):			
This organization perceives the public relations department, first and foremost, to be an advocate for the organization...	4.09	.27	.54
Nature of Communication (Two-Way):			
Most public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics.....	3.07	.08	.60
Media Relations as Example of Communication:			
When we provide information to the media, we use whatever information we can find on the possible effect the information will have on the public to make sure the public sees the organization more favorably.....	3.07	.28	.54
Role of Research:			
Before starting a public relations program, we usually look at attitude surveys to make sure we describe the organization and its policies in ways the public is likely to accept.....	2.58	.32	.53
Our public relations department uses attitude research by commercial firms or that it does itself to find out if we have been successful in changing people's attitudes.....	2.41	.45	.47

For Entire Scale (n = 52):
Cronbach's Alpha = .57
Split-Half Correlation = .41

TABLE 5
Reliability Analysis of Two-Way Symmetric Index

Item	Mean (Scale= 1-5)	Item-Total Correlation	Alpha Without Item
Purpose of Public Relations:			
The purpose of public relations in this organization is to develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and publics the organization affects.....	3.78	.31	.60
In this organization, public relations tries to change the attitudes and behavior of management as often as it tries to change the attitudes and behavior of publics....	2.64	.54	.52
Organizational Goal (Adaptation):			
In a broad sense, I would say the primary goal of our public relations program is to help the organization change to reduce the negative impact it has on its publics....	2.45	.18	.65
Public Relations Role (Mediation):			
This organization believes the public relations department should provide mediation for the organization--to help management and publics negotiate conflict.....	2.85	.63	.49
Nature of Communication (Two-Way):			
Most public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics.....	3.07	.37	.58
Media Relations as Example of Communication:			
*Our media relations philosophy is to open the organization to reporters and to help them to contact news sources inside the organization themselves.....	3.70	-.11	.63
Role of Research:			
We evaluate our public relations programs by doing surveys or informal research of how many people have been exposed to our programs and how much they have learned about the organization--not by surveys to find out if we have changed their attitudes.....	2.80	.10	.66
Before starting a public relations program, we try to do surveys or informal research to find out how much management and our publics understand how each other think..	2.66	.31	.60

*Item deleted from scale; correlation and Alpha based on 8-item scale (alpha = .53)
For 7-Item Scale (n = 52):
Cronbach's Alpha = .63
Split-Half Correlation = .47

relations, item-total correlations, and Cronbach's alpha if each item is removed from the index.

The four tables show that all eight items scaled well in the indices of the press-agentry/publicity and two-way asymmetric models (alpha = .74 and .57 respectively). Three items did not scale well in the public-information index, resulting in an alpha of only .36. When these items were removed from that index, however, alpha rose to .67. Likewise, one item did not scale well in the two-way symmetric index, and removing it increased alpha from .53 to .63. Generally, though, with these items removed we have four scales with acceptable reliability, especially since the sample size was small and a relatively small number of items was included in each index.

We have since rewritten seven of the 27 items and eliminated or changed single words in two others. The rewritten items included the four that did not scale well. These items had either high or low mean scores in general and thus did not discriminate among the scales. We also rewrote the control and adaptation goal items to make them less abstract (both had low mean scores) and rewrote the advocacy item to contrast it with dissemination and mediation as PR contributions to meeting organizational goals (it had a high mean score). The revised questionnaire is included in the appendix to this paper--coded to indicate the model each item measures. In future research, we will do additional reliability tests to determine if all items now scale properly. In the tables below, however, the scores on the public-information and two-way symmetric indices are based upon only five and seven items.

We also factor analyzed all 27 items together and separately

for the eight items in each index to see if the items grouped in ways other than those conceptualized as the four models. No such patterns emerged. When all 27 items were factor analyzed, nine factors resulted with an eigen value greater than 1.0. Most factors had only a few items loading highly, and none of the loadings suggested meaningful patterns of public relations behavior. For each set of index items, three factors resulted. However, there was one dominant factor in each case and high secondary loadings on all factors. In addition, the loadings on the dominant factors were almost identical to the item-total correlations in Tables 2-5.

Relationships Among the Indices

Table 6 compares the mean scores for all 52 respondents on the indices of the four public relations models. These data show the press-agentry/publicity model to be most common in these 16 organizations, followed by the two-way asymmetric model. The public-information model was least common. However, we did not have a random sample, and, in particular, we had eventually ended up with only one organization that truly practiced the public-information model--thus reducing the mean for that model. These data suggest the relative frequency with which organizations practice these four models, but a larger and random sample will be necessary to determine the actual frequency with which organizations practice each model.

Table 7 contains correlations between the four models. It shows that the one-way models and the two-way models correlate highly with each other and that the press-agentry and two-way asymmetric models correlate moderately. The public-information model, however, correlates negatively with all models but the

TABLE 6

Comparison of Indices for Models of Public Relations

Model	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage Above Midpoint of Scale
Press Agentry/Publicity	3.23	.73	65%
Public Information	2.77	.81	43%
Two-Way Asymmetric	3.16	.57	63%
Two-Way Symmetric	2.90	.66	55%

TABLE 7

Correlations Between Indices for Models of Public Relations

	Press Agentry/ Promotion	Public Information	Two-Way Asymmetric	Two-Way Symmetric
Press Agentry/ Promotion	---	.66	.14	-.34
Public Information		---	-.21	-.38
Two-Way Asymmetric			---	.44
Two-Way Symmetric				---

press-agentry model.

Importantly, these correlational data suggest that few organizations practice one model to the exclusion of others and that our theory will have to account for the presence of mixed models of public relations behavior.

Models Practiced in Each Organization

Next, we correlated the results from different practitioners who completed the questionnaire from the same organization to determine if different individuals in the same organization perceive the organization's public relations behavior in the same way. If the correlations are not high, we would have to conclude that the indices measure differing individual perceptions of organizational behavior rather than the organizational behavior itself.

Table 8 shows that the correlations between individuals were moderate to high in most organizations. The result of an analysis of variance included at the bottom of Table 9 also shows that the variance between organizations was significantly higher than the variance within organizations for all four indices. We can conclude, therefore, that different individuals within the same organization perceive the organization's public relations behavior in reasonably similar ways. However, the correlations are low enough to suggest that an average score from several individuals in the same organization will provide a better measure of an organization's public relations behavior than the score of a single individual from that organization.

In addition, the responses of higher-level public relations managers correlated higher with the responses of all other members of the department than the responses of lower-level practitioners--

TABLE 8

Correlations Among Respondents in the Same Organization, Based on 27 Items

Type of Organization	Number of Correlations in Range					Average Correlation	
	-.20-0	0-.20	.21-.40	.41-.60	.60+		
Department store			1			.38	
Airport promotion				1		.41	
Youth employment training			1	1	1	.55	
Handicapped services	1	1	3	4	1	.32	(.45)*
Food manufacturer				1		.53	
University agricultural information	2	3	7	3		.23	(.39)**
Scientific association		1	5	1	3	.46	(.61)*
Trade association	1	4	5	5		.32	(.40)*
State university campus		4	4	2		.26	
State university central administration	1	2	2	1		.25	
Postal agency		1				.17	
Telephone company		4	5	3	3	.37	
Transportation authority			1			.34	
Private university	1	4	5	5		.32	(.40)*
Average correlations for all organizations.....						.35	(.39)

*Average with one deviant respondent removed.
**Average with two deviant respondents removed.

especially those who are writers and publications specialists--correlated with each other. Those results suggest that the models should be measured through questionnaires given to higher-level managers rather than to lower-level technicians. That conclusion makes obvious sense, as the managers have a broader perspective on the actual behavior of the entire PR department than do the technicians.

Table 9 then shows the means and standard deviations for 14 organizations on each of the four models. These data show that we had predicted the right model for most of the organizations, although we were substantially off in estimating that the food manufacturer practiced the public-information model when it actually practiced a combination of the two two-way models.

Table 9 also shows that organizations practice one model more than the others, but that most combine two or more models. In particular, organizations that practice a two-way model combine both the symmetric and asymmetric models. And, most organizations include some degree of press agentry/publicity in their public relations behavior.

Finally, Table 9 shows that the variance within organizations was higher--reducing the F ratio--for the two-way symmetric model than for the other models. That result suggests that some individuals perceive that their departments practice this model while others in the same organization believe it does not. Perhaps some practitioners believe their department does practice this textbook model, while others do not delude themselves into thinking so.

In general, then, we can conclude that the four models of public relations can be measured and that organizations actually

TABLE 9

Means and Standard Deviations
on Indices for Four Models of Public Relations for 14 Organizations

Type of Organization and Expected Model	Index: Press Agent Mean	Press Agent S.D.	Public Info. Mean	Public Info. S.D.	2-Way Asym. Mean	2-Way Asym. S.D.	2-Way Sym. Mean	2-Way Sym. S.D.	N
Press Agentry									
Department store	3.81	.09	2.80	.00	2.56	.62	1.79	.51	2
Airport promotion	3.81	.27	2.00	.26	3.69	.44	3.21	.71	2
Youth employment training	3.63	.13	3.13	.31	2.71	.19	2.33	.08	3
Handicapped services	3.43	.26	2.64	.74	2.85	.53	2.45	.49	5
Public Information									
Food manufacturer	2.69	.27	1.90	.71	3.50	.35	3.29	.20	2
University agricultural information	3.25	.48	3.73	.53	2.60	.48	2.57	.65	6
Scientific association	4.67	.41	3.97	.33	3.78	.52	2.60	.97	5
Two-Way Asymmetric									
Trade association	3.17	.59	2.55	.63	3.41	.34	3.10	.39	8
State university campus	3.00	.51	2.60	.63	3.35	.27	3.46	.62	5
State university central administration	2.94	.65	2.60	.82	2.67	.19	2.82	.47	4
Postal agency	3.50	.53	2.70	.99	4.00	.00	3.64	.10	2
Two-Way Symmetric									
Telephone Company	2.44	.42	2.33	.78	3.38	.45	3.02	.64	6
Transportation authority	3.00	.18	2.70	.14	2.94	.62	3.29	.20	2
Private university	2.53	.55	2.20	.55	2.95	.54	3.20	.46	5
Total Sample	3.23	.73	2.77	.81	3.16	.57	2.90	.66	58
F ratio (variance between organizations/ variance within organizations)	7.09***		3.80***		3.16***		2.29*		

***p<.001
**p<.01
*p<.05

practice one or more of them. We turn next to independent variables to explain when and why organizations practice one or more of the models.

ENVIRONMENTAL NICHES AND ORGANIZATIONAL TYPES

With the new concept of four public relations models, and the recognition that organizations mix these models, we seem to have the ingredients for a more complex theory that can explain diverse public relations activities found in the real world. The variance in these public relations variables cannot be explained, however, unless we also have a more complex set of environmental and organizational variables to explain public relations behavior.

The 1976 monograph emphasized structural variables--primarily centralization, stratification, formalization, and complexity--in attempting to explain public relations behavior. Now, however, the organizational literature suggests that environmental variables will explain public relations behavior better than structural variables and that both the structural and public relations variables depend upon the environment of the organization.

Four environmental variables, in particular, seem to explain public relations behavior: scale of demand, knowledge complexity, constraints, and uncertainty. Scale and complexity come from what I call the product/service environment of an organization. Constraints and uncertainty come from what I call the political/ regulatory environment. I believe that each of these two components of an organization's environment stimulate a different public relations model--thus accounting for mixed models of public relations behavior. Separating the product/service environment from the po-

litical/regulatory environment also seems to resolve a long-standing unsolved problem in public relations theory: why organizations so often mix marketing communication and public relations.

The Product/Service Environment

Hage and Hull have recently developed a typology of organizations and environmental niches that goes beyond the simple Burns and Stalker (1961) dichotomy of mechanistic vs. organic organizations that has dominated organization theory for over 20 years (Hage, 1980; Hage and Hull, 1981; Hull and Hage, 1981; Hull, 1981). Hage and Hull developed their typology from two environmental variables: scale of demand and knowledge complexity. Although I classify both variables as environmental variables, Hage and Hull describe them as characteristics of both the environment and the technology used by the organization. For example, Hage and Hull say that organizations with large-scale demand for their products or services in the environment use large-scale technology to produce the products or services. Similarly, they say that an organization with complex knowledge in its environment has more complex tasks to perform--more complex 'task scope'--and employs more specialized personnel.

Hage and Hull use the economist's term 'scale' rather than the more common concept of 'size.' An organization can get larger without necessarily increasing the scale of its production. In economic theory, scale means that all elements of a production process are increased in exactly the same proportion. The result can be what economists call 'economies of scale.' A firm can produce one of 1 million television sets, for example, using the same combination of inputs as it would to produce one of 10 sets. But

the firm can produce the one of 1 million sets more efficiently than one of 10 sets because of economies of scale. Size is different, however. A firm can get larger by producing shoes as well as TV sets without changing the scale of production.

Hage and Hull (1981:9) thus define scale as the "distribution of similar quantities over time" and contrast it to knowledge complexity, which they define as "the relationship among a number of qualities distributed in space." More knowledge and more specialists will be needed to produce a computer, for example, than a shoe. A lot of people must apply their qualititative knowledge, and take up space doing it, to produce the more complex product or service.

Hage and Hull say the organic-mechanistic dichotomy assumed that scale and complexity would always vary together. Thus, Burns and Stalker (1961) described organic organizations as having both a complex and small-scale environment and described mechanistic organizations as having a less-complex, large-scale environment. Organizational theorists assumed that organic organizations would stress innovation in order to cope with their complex, but small-scale, environment and that mechanistic organizations would stress efficiency in producing less-complex products for which there was a large-scale demand.

Hage and Hull argue, however, that scale and complexity can interact and that different combinations of the two variables have different effects. Four types of organizations can be identified using the combinations of the two variables. In addition to the organic and mechanistic organizations (which have both high or low scale and complexity), there also can be an organization with small

scale and low knowledge complexity (which they call a traditional organization) and an organization with large scale and high complexity (which they call a mixed organic-mechanistic organization). Table 10 depicts this typology and contains a hypothesized public relations model that each type of organization would seem most likely to use to support the marketing of its products and services.

TABLE 10

A Typology of Four Organizations, Based on Product/Service Environment, And the Hypothesized Model of Public Relations Practiced by Each

Knowledge Complexity	Scale of Demand and Production: Small	Scale of Demand and Production: Large
Low	Traditional Organization (Press Agentry/ Publicity Model)	Mechanistic Organization (Public Information Model)
High	Organic Organization (Two-Way Symmetric Model)	Mixed Mechanistic/ Organic Organization (Mixed Two-Way Asymmetric/Symmetric Model)

Because Hage and Hull derived this typology of organizations from the scale and complexity of an organization's technology, the typology should explain how each type of organization uses public relations communication to support the marketing of its products or services. Marketing public relations can follow each of the four models of public relations. Let's look at each type of organization to understand how.

The Traditional Organization. This organization produces a product or service of little complexity for which large-scale pro-

duction is not possible. Hage and Hull (1981:23) said such traditional enterprises as clothing, furniture, housing, and restaurants fit the type. Traditional organizations are not highly structured: they have a medium level of centralization, stratification, and formalization. Press agents seem likely to provide marketing public relations for traditional organization, by doing whatever they can to make the product known to purchasers. There is little need for the press agents to seek information from consumers on how to improve or change the product.

The Mechanistic Organization. These large-scale organizations produce products or services for which there is a large, stable demand. Thus, they emphasize efficiency and achieve it through a highly centralized and stratified structure, although they are only moderate in formalization (number of rules). Because their markets are large and stable, these organizations have little need to seek information from consumers. They use the public-information model to give consumers or users factual information about their product or service. A large, routine government agency such as the Internal Revenue Service or an automobile company are examples.

The Organic Organization. Organic organizations, such as electronics or precision instrument companies or small research laboratories, face small, uncertain, and variable markets. Most produce complex products or services, which have a short life and must be replaced often. Such organizations must have a structure that makes it easy to adapt to their environments; thus they are decentralized and low on stratification and formalization. And, most of these organizations would be expected to use the two-way symmetric model of marketing public relations to help them adapt to

their complex, changing product/service environments.

The Mixed Mechanistic/Organic Organization. Hage and Hull (1981:25) said mixed organizations have complex technology--making research and development important. But they encounter a large demand for their products and must use large-scale production processes to satisfy that demand efficiently. These are the large, modern corporations we know today, such as chemical, computer, or drug companies. Because large-scale production requires efficiency and complex technology requires innovation, mechanistic/organic organizations generally combine the structural characteristics of both the mechanistic and organic organization: moderate centralization and stratification combined with high formalization. These firms must hire the most "marketing, advertising, and sales personnel to merchandize a diversified array of products" (Hage and Hull, 1981:26). Thus, they probably use the two-way asymmetric model for their marketing public relations, although many will also use the two-way symmetric model to help them keep in touch with consumers in complex and changing markets.

In retrospect, then, this four-way typology helps to make sense of the results in my 1976 monograph. My "problem-solving organizations," which practiced both "synchronic" and "diachronic" public relations (two-way asymmetric and symmetric marketing public relations) now seem to fit the mixed organic/mechanistic type perfectly. The small and new organizations, which hired professional public relations people and practiced "diachronic" public relations, now seem to be the small, organic organizations in Table 10--the only organizations for which pure marketing public relations based on the two-way symmetric model makes sense. My fatal-

istic organizations probably consisted of both traditional and mechanistic organizations. The confounding of effects would explain why the data showed no consistent public relations behavior for the fatalistic organizations.

The product/service environment explains only part of an organization's public relations behavior, however. Relationships with publics, pressure groups, and governments--in the political/regulatory environment--generate separate models of public relations behavior.

The Political/Regulatory Environment

At about the beginning of the twentieth century, large organizations began to lose the unlimited autonomy they had from their environments. Labor unions, pressure groups, and regulatory agencies forced organizations to adapt to, rather than dominate, their environments. Organizations generally prefer to have autonomy to behave as they wish, and environmental constraints on that autonomy--my third environmental variable--seem to generate public relations activities to preserve or restore autonomy (Hage, 1980:451-452; Grunig, 1976:12-15). Environmental constraints generate a different kind of public relations from that generated by the scale and complexity variables. In fact, many organizations call public relations behaviors generated by what I call the political/regulatory environment "public affairs" rather than "public relations" (Grunig and Hunt, 1984:Chapter 14).

The four models of public relations vary along two major dimensions: whether public relations is symmetric or asymmetric and whether it is one-way or two-way. Environmental constraints explain the symmetry of public relations communication, and the fourth

variable--environmental uncertainty--explains whether communication is one-way or two-way.

Environmental Constraints. Research on how organizations respond to pressure groups and to government regulation in practicing social responsibility (Mintzberg, 1983:517-645) suggests that the symmetry of public relations activities has a curvilinear relationship to the extent of environmental constraints.

When organizations have almost complete autonomy from their environments, they have the ability to dominate the environment and use that ability by practicing asymmetric public relations (Hage, 1980:455). When organized publics--pressure groups--threaten the organization's autonomy--a middle level of environmental constraint--the organization is most likely to practice symmetric public relations as part of an effort to demonstrate that it can be socially responsible without government regulation (Mintzberg, 1983:586).

At a high level of constraint, organizations have less motivation to demonstrate social responsibility because their behavior is determined for them by government regulations or other constraining forces. When they are highly constrained by government regulations, organizations revert to asymmetric public relations either to try to eliminate regulation or to justify maintaining regulation. Using asymmetric public relations to preserve regulation may sound strange, but many business firms welcome regulation--AT&T for example--and often capture the agencies that regulate them (Mintzberg, 1983:578). As Mintzberg (1983:579) explained, regulation can create economies of scale in dealing with the government.

Environmental Uncertainty. The literature on organizational environments contains such variables as environmental homogeneity, stability, dispersion, consensus, and turbulence (Aldrich, 1979:63-70). Although each of these variables differs, each can be fit into a larger construct called environmental uncertainty. The more heterogeneous, unstable, dispersed, and turbulent are the publics and other systems that make up an organization's environment and the more dissensus among them, the more uncertain its political/regulatory environment will be.

Environmental uncertainty should have a linear relationship with the extent to which public relations communication is one-way or two-way. When uncertainty is low, organizations have little reason to seek information and will limit their public relations to one-way information giving. When uncertainty is high, however, organizations must seek information to monitor the environment; thus their communication will be two-way.

TABLE 11

A Typology of Public Relations Models
Based on the Political/Regulatory Environment

Environmental Uncertainty	Extent of Environmental Constraints: Low	Medium	High
Low	Press Agentry/ Publicity	Public Information	Press Agentry/ Publicity
High	Two-Way Asymmetric	Two-Way Symmetric	Two-Way Asymmetric

We can put these two variables from the political/regulatory environment together, therefore, to generate a second typology that explains why organizations practice each of the four models of

public relations (Table 11). The typology shows that under conditions of low uncertainty, public relations will vary from press agentry to public information and back to press agentry as constraints increase. Under high uncertainty, public relations will vary from the two-way asymmetric model to the two-way symmetric model and back to the two-way asymmetric with increasing uncertainty.

Mixed Models of Public Relations

If organizations have two distinct portions of their environments that generate public relations activities, we have a logical explanation for the mixed models of public relations found in the 16 case study organizations described above. Each organization practiced a dominant model of public relations, but each also practiced one or two of the other models to a lesser extent. Which model will dominate in an organization's public relations department depends on whether the political/regulatory or product/service environment dominates and on which model fits that dominant portion of the environment best.

The public relations department usually helps other subsystems of the organization communicate with the part of the environment assigned to that subsystem (Grunig and Hunt, 1984:8-9). Thus, the public relations department may practice a different model of public relations when it helps different subsystems with their communication problems. A large corporation, for example, may provide two-way asymmetric public relations to support the marketing subsystem and two-way symmetric public relations to help the management subsystem deal with its political problems.

Likewise, public relations firms should find that clients with

different environments demand different models of public relations. They should also find that client demands change as political/regulatory problems appear and take precedence over product/service problems. If political problems decline in importance, however, clients should return to a concern with product/service problems.

Internal communication should follow the same patterns as external communication. Organizations whose product/service environments are of greatest importance should stress quality of work in the mechanistic organization, for example, or human relations gimmicks in the traditional organization. Organic organizations, in contrast, would help employees carry on two-way symmetric communication with consumers or clients. When the political environment dominantes, however, organizations may turn to 'economic-education' programs to help their employees understand the political problems brought on by government and activist publics. And these internal education programs generally follow different models of public relations, depending on the extent of environmental constraints and uncertainty.

Values of the Dominant Coalition

Throughout his 1980 book, Hage included what could be considered an "easy way out" for the researcher who does not find an expected correlation between an organizational and environmental variable. He pointed out that his is an equilibrium theory and that at times organizations may be out of equilibrium with their environments. The result of disequilibrium would be low correlations between variables expected to correlate highly.

Yet, Hage's insight is an important one for research on public relations. Quite often, an organization does not practice the model

of public relations that would move it toward equilibrium with its environment because the powerful people who run the organization--the "dominant coalition" in organizational theory--do not understand or value public relations. Nanni (1980), for example, found that the training in public relations of the management person to whom the public relations director reported was the best predictor of when the two-way symmetric model was practiced.

Thus, what Hage (1980) calls the political-value perspective in organizational theory also has relevance to public relations. If the dominant coalition does not value communication with publics or has no concern for environmental systems, the organization will not practice a model of public relations that is best for that organization. What the dominant coalition values also depends on who is in the dominant coalition (Pennings and Goodman, 1977). If top public relations managers or representatives of key external publics are in the dominant coalition or if other members of the coalition understand and value public relations, the organization will be most likely to practice an equilibrium model of public irelations.

We now have a complete theory of organizations, environments, and public relations. In the final section, therefore, we look at exploratory research on 16 organizations to find support for the theory or reason to refine or reject it.

EXPLORATORY RESEARCH ON 16 ORGANIZATIONS

After administering the four indices of the public relations models to several public relations people in the 14 organizations described in Tables 8 and 9, graduate students at the University of Maryland also conducted in-depth, open-end interviews with a top

public relations manager in each organization to determine the nature of that organization's structure and environment and the extent to which the dominant coalition valued public relations. Two other organizations for which only partial measures of the four models could be obtained were included in this analysis that were not included in Tables 8 and 9: a large communication association and the public affairs department--managed separately from public relations--of a large communication firm. To make sense of these results, we grouped the organizations according to the dominant public relations model and looked for similarities in the variables examined.

Press Agentry/Publicity Model Dominant

Five organizations had their highest mean scores on the press-agentry/publicity model: a department store, an airport promotion unit, an organization providing employment training for youth, an association raising funds for and sponsoring programs for the handicapped, and a scientific association.

None of these organizations have significant negative consequences on publics that would generate an active political/regulatory environment. All use public relations to promote products, raise funds, or sell services to members (in the scientific organization)--to deal with the product/service environment. In the department store, for example, the public relations manager interviewed said public relations was a stopping-off point on the promotional ladder in sales and marketing. The public relations director in the youth training organization asserted that public relations had no role other than to support advertising and sales. The airport promotion agency was part of a transportation agency's

Office of Trade and Development.

Each of these organizations, therefore, fit the "traditional" type of organization. All had small-scale and stable demand, little competition, and simple products and services. The scientific organization services scientists who have a complex environment, but the public relations unit existed more to sell the association's products--which were not complex--to members, rather than to communicate about scientific research to nonscientists.

In each organization, the public relations department was small and consisted mostly of communication technicians who also had managerial responsibilities. Yet, as Hage and Hull theorized, the organizations were not highly structured. The public relations people had access to top management and were part of the dominant coalition. The public relations people were not in the dominant coalition to represent external publics, however. They were valued employees because of the centrality of marketing and promotion to the organization.

Organizations practicing the press agentry model thus fit our theory: they are small, traditional organizations with few political problems and whose dominant coalition values press agentry as a means of producing and controlling consumer demand.

Public-Information Model Dominant

Only one organization--a university's agricultural information unit--practiced the public information model as its dominant model of public relations, although the scientific association and the youth employment organization also had scores above the mean on this model.

Although colleges of agriculture face some political opposi-

tion, most face few activist groups and little constraint from the political environment. Thus, the product/service environment seems to determine public relations for this organization, as its major task is to promote the university's agricultural research to users.

This college of agriculture faces a large-scale, complex environment. As a mixed organization, most employees had autonomy and the structure was not highly centralized, formalized, or stratified as a mechanistic organization would be. According to our theory, the college should practice a mix of two-way symmetric and two-way asymmetric communication. Thus, the public relations unit appears to be out of equilibrium with the organization's environment, mostly because public relations people do not appear to participate in the dominant coalition and members of that coalition do not understand the two-way symmetric model. The practitioners interviewed perceived the necessity for the two-way symmetric model but did not have the power inside the organization to implement it.

Two-Way Asymmetric Model Dominant/Two-Way Symmetric Secondary

Four organizations had their highest score on the two-way asymmetric model, along with high secondary scores on the two-way symmetric model: the food manufacturer, a local telephone company, a government postal service, and a national business trade association. All four organizations use public relations to deal with both the political/regulatory and product/service environments.

In the political/regulatory environment, the food company and the trade association face few opposing groups (although the members of the association would be in the middle-level of environmental constraints--pressure but moderate regulation). The telephone company and postal service are highly regulated. All organi-

zations face uncertain political/regulatory environments. Two are at the low-constraint end of Table 11, and two are at the high-constraint end. As expected, the result is two-way asymmetric public relations for all four organizations.

In the product/service environment, all four organizations appear to be mixed organizations with large-scale and complex environments--although the food manufacturer and postal service face less-complex environments than the other two. As Hage and Hull predicted, all are relatively decentralized but relatively high in stratification and formalization. Being mixed mechanistic/organic organizations explains the mix of two-way symmetric and asymmetric public relations practiced by these four organizations, which was also predicted in Table 10.

In all of these organizations, the public relations people interviewed said public relations employees were part of the dominant coalition and that the coalition valued public relations objectives. As a result, public relations behavior appears to be in equilibrium with both parts of the environment.

Two-Way Symmetric Model Dominant/Two Way Asymmetric Secondary

The five orgnizations in this category consisted of the state university campus, private university, transportation authority, communication association, and public affairs unit of a large communication firm. (The central administration unit of the state university had no dominant model.) Although these organizations are not homogeneous, they generally fit into the high-uncertainty, moderate constraints segment of the political/regulatory environment (the communication firm is an exception) and into either the organic or mixed mechanistic/organic segment of the product service

environment.

In the political environment, the state university faces moderate constraints from state government and the private university from its governing board. The association and transportation authority must deal with many pressure groups. Although the transportation authority also faces regulation from several local, state, and national governments, it has relative autonomy from any one of them because so many levels of government regulate it. As Table 11 predicts, then, most of these organizations practice the two-way symmetric model for the political/regulatory environment.

In the product/service environment, the private university appears to be an organic organization, the state university and communication firm to be mixed organizations, and the transportation authority to be between a traditional and mechanistic organization. The public affairs unit of the communication firm, by definition, does not deal with product/service problems, however, and the communication association does not use public relations for marketing purposes. As expected, the two universities use the two-way symmetric model or a mixture of the two two-way models for the marketing part of their public relations behavior. The transportation authority was high on press agentry as well as the two two-way models in Table 9, and its traditional product/service environment seems to explain why.

For all of these organizations, the interviewers were told that public relations managers are part of the dominant coalition and that other members of the coalition value public relations. As a result, the five organizations practice an equilibrium model of public relations.

IN CONCLUSION

Most of this article has been devoted to the building of a theory rather than to the collection and analysis of data. The theoretical insights reported here resulted from reading the organizational literature, developing measures of the public relations models, and doing exploratory research on a small number of organizations. All were mixed in a cauldron and stirred by pure thought. Because the article is more theoretical than empirical, I cannot say that I have developed and proven the perfect public relations theory. However, I do believe I have produced a theory with great promise for explaining and predicting the practice of public relations. And I hope I have produced a theory that will stimulate other researchers to do research to confirm and perfect it.

The author would like to express appreciation to Larissa Schneider, an instructor in the College of Journalism, University of Maryland, and a doctoral student in the Public Communication Program at Maryland for suggesting the Hage-Hall typology used in this paper and for her continuing contributions to the theory presented here. In addition, he acknowledges the contribution of the following graduate students who conducted the in-depth interviews reported in this paper: Charles Miro, Sally McMillan, Shelley Smith, Jane Silverstein, Debra Fabiszak, Ruth Pollack, Ellyn Pollack, Kathryn Theus, Walton Bishop, Robert Myers, Christopher Chiames, Rick Borchelt, and Debra Peterson.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, Howard E. (1979), Organizations & Environments (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.).

Bernays, Edward L. (1928), Propaganda (New York: Liveright).

Burns, Tom and G. M. Stalker (1961), The Management of Innovation (London: Tavistock Publications).

Cronbach, Lee J. (1970): Essentials of Psychological Testing, 3d ed. (New York: Harper & Row).

Cutlip, Scott M. and Allen H. Center (1952), Effective Public Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall).

Ehling, William P. (1981), "A Theory of Public Relations Management: Application of Decision, Conflict, Interorganizational, and Communiction Conceptual Schemes to Public Relations Practice," paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, East Lansing, Mich.

Grunig, James E. (1976), "Organizations and Public Publics: Testing a Communication Theory," Journalism Monographs No. 46 (November).

Grunig, James E. (1983), "Communication Behaviors and Attitudes of Environmental Publics: Two Studies," Journalism Monographs No. 81 (March).

Grunig, James E. and Todd Hunt (1984), Managing Public Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

Hage, Jerald (1980), Theories of Organizations: Form, Process, & Transformation (New York: Wiley Interscience).

Hage, Jerald and Frank Hull (1981), "Determinants of Organizational Structure and the Consequences for Industrial Innovation," Working Paper No. 1, Center for the Study of Innovation, Productivity & Strategy, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, in cooperation with the Research Program for Innovation and Productivity Strategies, Rutgers University, Newark, N.J.

Hull, Frank (1981), "Innovative Payoff from R&D: A Strategic Framework for Designing Organizations to Maximize Performances of Choice," Working Paper No. 3, Center for the Study of Innovation, Productivity & Strategy, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, in cooperation with the Research Program for Innovation and Productivity Strategies, Rutgers University, Newark, N.J.

Hull, Frank and Jerald Hage (1981), "Beyond Burns and Stalker: Multiple Kinds of Organic and Mechanical Organizations," Working Paper No. 2, Center for the Study of Innovation, Productivity & Strategy, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, in cooperation with the Research Program for Innovation and Productivity Strategies, Rutgers University, Newark, N.J.

Mintzberg, Henry (1983), Power In and Around Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall).

Nanni, Elizabeth (1980), "Case Studies of Organizational Management and Public Relations Practices," master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Pennings, Johannes M. and Paul S. Goodman (1977), "Toward A Workable Framework," in Paul S. Goodman and Johannes M. Pennings (eds.), New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), pp. 146-184.

Thayer, Lee (1968), Communication and Communication Systems (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin).

APPENDIX

Revised Questionnaire to Measure Models of Public Relations (Coded to Show Model to Which Each Item Applies)

Please read each statement carefully and check the response that describes how much you agree or disagree that the statement describes the way public relations is practiced in your organization. YOUR RESPONSE SHOULD SHOW HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTUALLY IS PRACTICED, NOT THE WAY YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE PRACTICED. Circle 5 if you strongly agree that the statement is true for your organization, circle 4 if you moderately agree, circle 3 if you think the statement is neither true nor false, circle 2 if you moderately disagree, and 1 if you strongly disagree.

	HA	MA	N	MD	HD
*1. The purpose of public relations in this organization is to promote the organization, its products, and services in any way possible. (PA).....	5	4	3	2	1
2. Before starting a public relations program, we usually look at attitude surveys to make sure we describe the organization and its policies in ways the public is most likely to accept. (2A).....	5	4	3	2	1
*3. In a broad sense, I would say a primary goal of our public relations program is get publics to behave in the way the organization wants them to behave (PA & 2A).	5	4	3	2	1
*4. Our media relations philosophy is to disseminate accurate information to the media but not to volunteer information that is unfavorable to the organization. (PI)	5	4	3	2	1
*5. This organization perceives the public relations department to be an advocate for the organization rather than an advocate for publics or a mediator between the organization and its publics (PA & 2A)..	5	4	3	2	1
6. The purpose of public relations in this organization is to persuade the public to agree with the organization's point-of-view. (2A).....	5	4	3	2	1
7. We evaluate our public relations programs by doing surveys or informal research of how many people have been exposed to our programs and how much they have learned about the organization--not by surveys to find out if we have changed their attitudes. (2S).....	5	4	3	2	1
8. Most public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication--from the organization to publics. (PA & PI).....	5	4	3	2	1
9. The purpose of public relations in this organization is to develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and publics the organization affects. (2S).....	5	4	3	2	1

*Revised items.

	HA	MA	N	MD	HD
10. Our public relations people believe that public relations essentially is an art that cannot be measured and evaluated. (PA).....	5	4	3	2	1
11. In our public relations department, nearly everyone is so busy writing news stories or producing publications that there is no time to do any research.(PI)..	5	4	3	2	1
*12. In a broad sense, I would say a primary goal of our public relations program is to help the organization change so that behaves as publics want it to behave.. (PI & 2S)	5	4	3	2	1
13. If people show up for an event or use our products or services, we know that our public relations efforts have been successful. (PA).....	5	4	3	2	1
14. In this organization, public relations tries to change the attitudes and behavior of management as often as it tries to change the attitudes and behavior of publics. (2S).....	5	4	3	2	1
*15. This organization believes the public relations department should be more of a disseminator of information than an advocate for the organization or a mediator between management and publics. (PI).....	5	4	3	2	1
16. In this organization, public relations and promotion mean essentially the same thing. (PA).....	5	4	3	2	1
17. Most public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics. (2A & 2S).....	5	4	3	2	1
*18. In our media relations, we try to provide only information that will help the public to see the organization more favorably. (2A).....	5	4	3	2	1
19. This organization believes the public relations department should provide mediation for the organization--to help management and publics negotiate conflict (2S).....	5	4	3	2	1
*20. The purpose of public relations in this organization is to disseminate information to the public (PI)....	5	4	3	2	1
21. Keeping a clipping file is about the only way we have of monitoring the success of our public relations programs. (PI).....	5	4	3	2	1

	HA	MA	N	MD	HD
22. In this organization, we try to determine what public attitudes are toward the organization and how they might be changed. (2A).....	5	4	3	2	1
*23. Our media relations philosophy is to open the organization to reporters and to help them to contact news sources inside the organization themselves, more than to release information to the media ourselves (2S)..	5	4	3	2	1
24. In this organization, public relations people are essentially journalists in residence. (PI).....	5	4	3	2	1
25. Our public relations department uses attitude research by commercial firms or that it does itself to find out if we have been successful in changing people's attitudes. (2A).....	5	4	3	2	1
26. Our media relations program strives to get favorable publicity into the media and to keep unfavorable publicity out. (PA).....	5	4	3	2	1
27. Before starting a public relations program, we try to do surveys or informal research to find out how much management and our publics understand how each other think. (2S).....	5	4	3	2	1